

REMARKS

Claims 101-120 are currently pending. By this Reply, Applicant has amended claims 101 and 112. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added by these amendments and that such amendments are supported by the Application as originally filed. Accordingly, claims 101-120 are at issue.

The Examiner has rejected claims 101, 102, 106, 107, 111, 112, 117 and 118 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 101, as amended herein, is directed to a table game system that includes a table display for different types of presentations, including presentation of a bonus game or entertainment presentations. The system includes a table interface device configured to allow the dealer to change the video information provided to the controller (and thus change the presentations displayed on the table display). The system also includes a moveably mounted player interface device that allows any of the players playing at the player positions on the gaming table, to provide an input during a bonus game displayed on the table display.

None of the references, either alone or properly combined, disclose a game system (as otherwise set forth in claim 101) that requires a table interface device configured to allow the dealer to change the presentations on the table display. Additionally, none of the references alone or properly combined disclose the player input device as required in claim 1.

The newly cited reference to DeMar et al. is not properly combinable with the other references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. DeMar et al. is not concerned with the problem of inputting information for a bonus game associated with a game played on a gaming table. Moreover, DeMar et al. is not concerned with providing any of a plurality of players the ability to provide an input through the player interface device. Instead, the device in DeMar et al. is to provide a single player the ability to control one or more slot machines from a remote location.

In particular, the controller in DeMar et al. is intended for “remote” control of a slot machine and is designed to operate at a location removed from the machine. As set forth in the Summary of the Invention in DeMar et al., the “gaming system further features a portable controller which is operatively associated with and spaced from the slot machine to remotely play the game on the slot machine.” (DeMar et al., column 2, lines 25-27).

The proposed modifications to Vancura set forth by the Examiner totally change the system disclosed therein. In effect, the Examiner is bestowing additional functionality to the system of Vancura (under the guise of obviousness) to create an entirely unique system – that is, the presently claimed invention. To do so, the Examiner has cobbled together four separate references to reconstruct the presently claimed system. In this regard, the Examiner is using the claim as a template, and is employing hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose pieces of prior art to build the invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 as now amended, is not taught by the combination of references set forth and is patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al.

Claims 102, 106, 107 and 111 depend from claim 1 and include each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 102, 106, 107 and 111 are also patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al.

Claim 112 was similarly amended to require the table interface means to be configured to allow the dealer the ability to change presentations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 112 is patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al.

Claims 117 and 118 depend from claim 112 and include each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 117 and 118 are also patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al.

The Examiner has rejected claims 103-105 and 114-116 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al., and further in view of Dettor. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claims 101 and 112 are patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al. Dettor is provided as disclosing presentation of a banner, scrolling text and a bitmap image, and does not cure the deficiencies of Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al. as noted. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 101 and 112 are also patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al., and further in view of Dettor.

Claims 103-105 depend on claim 101 and include each of its limitations, and claims 114-116 depend on claim 112 and include each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits

claims 103-105 and 114-116 are also patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al., and further in view of Dettor.

The Examiner has rejected claims 108-110, 119 and 120 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al., and further in view of Izumi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claims 101 and 112 are patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al. Izumi et al. is provided as disclosing a user's ability to update files and does not cure the deficiencies of Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al. as noted. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 101 and 112 are also patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al., and further in view of Izumi et al.

Claims 108-110 depend on claim 101 and include each of its limitations, and claims 119-120 depend on claim 112 and include each of its limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 108-110 and 119-120 are also patentable over Vancura in view of Marnell, II and Knust et al. and DeMar et al., and further in view of Izumi et al.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 101-120. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if there are any questions regarding this Reply.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 24, 2008

By: /Richard C. Himelhoch/
Richard C. Himelhoch, Reg. No. 35,544
Ungaretti & Harris LLP
70 West Madison
Suite 3500
Chicago, IL 60602
312.977.4400

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited electronically, via EFS-Web on July 24, 2008.

/Kathleen Rundquist/